

DECISION RECORD

DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2016-1028-EA 2017 Reynolds South Brown Lake Pipeline

Proposed Decision: It is my decision to implement the BLM-Preferred Alternative as described in DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2016-1028-EA and to authorize the construction of the 2017 Reynolds South Brown Lake Pipeline. The mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Assessment have been formulated into terms and conditions that will be attached to the Cooperative Range Improvement Permit. This decision incorporates, by reference, those conditions identified in the attached Environmental Assessment.

The Proposed Action will be in compliance with the 1997 Roswell Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision and the 2001 New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management.

If you wish to protest this proposed decision in accordance with 43 CFR 4160.2, you are allowed 15 days to do so in person or in writing to the authorized officer, after the receipt of this decision. Please be specific in your points of protest.

The protest shall be filed with the Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management, 2909 West 2nd, Roswell, NM 88201. This protest should specify, clearly and concisely, why you think the proposed action is in error.

In the absence of a protest within the time allowed, the above decision shall constitute my final decision. Should this notice become the final decision, you are allowed an additional 30 days within which to file an appeal for the purpose of a hearing before the Interior Board of Land Appeals, and to petition for stay of the decision pending final determination on the appeal (43 CFR 4.21 and 4.410). If a petition for stay is not requested and granted, the decision will be put into effect following the 30-day appeal period. The appeal and petition for stay should be filed with the Field Manager at the above address. The appeal should specify, clearly and concisely, why you think the decision is in error. The petition for stay should specify how you will be harmed if the stay is not granted.

/s/ Laura Hronec
Acting for Kyle Arnold
Assistant Field Manager

07/25/2016
Date

DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2016-1028-EA

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

I have determined that the BLM Preferred Alternative (Alternative A), as described in the Environmental Assessment (EA) will not have any significant impact, individually or cumulatively, on the quality of the human environment. Because there would not be any significant impact, an environmental impact statement is not required. The NEPA handbook (p. 83) indicates that the FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI) must succinctly state the reasons for deciding that the action will have no significant environmental effects. It also recommends that the FONSI address the relevant context and intensity factors.

In making this determination, I considered the following factors:

1. The activities described in the BLM Preferred Alternative (Alternative A) do not include any significant beneficial or adverse impacts (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(1)). The EA includes a description of the expected environmental consequences of authorizing the construction of the 2017 Reynolds South Brown Lake Pipeline.
2. The activities included in the proposed action would not significantly affect public health or safety (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)).
3. The proposed activities would not significantly affect any unique characteristics (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) of the geographic area such as prime and unique farmlands, caves, wild and scenic rivers, designated wilderness areas or wilderness study areas.
4. The activities described in the proposed action do not involve effects on the human environment that are likely to be highly controversial (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4)).
5. The activities described in the proposed action do not involve effects that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(5)).
6. My decision to implement these activities does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(6)).
7. The effects of authorizing the construction of the pipeline, storage and tub would not be significant, individually or cumulatively, when considered with the effects of other actions (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7)). The EA discloses that there are no other connected or cumulative actions that would cause significant cumulative impacts.
8. I have determined that the activities described in the proposed action will not adversely affect or cause loss or destruction of scientific, cultural, or historical resources, including those listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)). Cultural resource surveys in the allotment have been generally limited to inspections ahead of oil and gas related activities, such as well locations and pipelines. Many areas of the allotment have been generally inventoried for cultural resources. The existing cultural data for the allotment and adjacent areas seems to be a good example of what can be reasonably expected to occur in the remainder of the allotment. No site-specific

situations are known to exist where current grazing practices conflict with cultural resource preservation and management. Some mitigation is included in the proposed action to protect cultural resources from grazing practices, such as: "In the event that grazing practices are determined to have an adverse effect on cultural resources within the allotment, the BLM, in consultation with the permittee, will take action(s) to mitigate or otherwise negate the effects. This may include but is not limited to installing physical barriers to protect the affected cultural resources, relocating the livestock grazing practice(s) that is (are) causing the adverse effect(s), or any other treatment as appropriate. Pages 20-21 of the EA describe the affected environment and impacts of the proposed action and alternatives on cultural resources.

9. The proposed activities are not likely to adversely affect any endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)). Within the allotment there are no known populations of threatened and endangered species, or designated critical habitat within the allotment.

10. The proposed activities will not threaten any violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)). Page 5 of the EA describes the conformance with land use plans and relationships to statutes, regulations, or other plans.

APPROVED:

/s/ Laura Hronec
Acting for Kyle S. Arnold
Assistant Field Manager, Resources

7/25/2016
Date

United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2016-10281-EA

2017 Reynolds South Brown Lake Pipeline, Storage and Tub, Allotment Number 64018

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Pecos District
Roswell Field Office
2909 West Second Street
Roswell, NM 88201-2019
Phone: (575) 627-0272
FAX: (575) 627-0276

Roswell Field Office


Confidentiality Policy

Any comments, including names and street addresses of respondents, that you submit may be made available for public review. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or street address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your written comment. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.



Table of Contents

1.0 Purpose and Need for Action.....	4
1.1 Introduction	4
1.2 Purpose and Need for Action.....	4
1.3 Decisions to be Made.....	4
1.4 Conformance with Applicable Land Use Plan(s)	5
1.5 Relationship to Statutes, Regulations or Other Plans	5
1.6 Scoping, Public Involvement, and Issues	5
2.0 Proposed Action and Alternative(s)	5
2.1 Alternatives Considered by Not Analyzed in Detail	7
2.2 No Action Alternative.....	7
3.0 Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Cumulative Impacts	8
3.1 Soil / Water / Air	8
➤ Climate.....	8
➤ Soils.....	10
➤ Air Quality	11
➤ Watershed Hydrology.....	13
➤ Water Quality - Surface	14
➤ Water Quality - Ground	15
3.2 Archaeology	16
➤ Cultural and Historical Resource	16
➤ Native American Religious Concerns.....	17
3.3 Range	18
➤ Vegetation	18
➤ Livestock Grazing.....	20
➤ Invasive, Non-Native Species.....	21
3.4 Wildlife Biology	23
➤ Wildlife.....	23
3.5 Visual Resources	25
3.6 Cave and Karst.....	26
3.7 Paleontology	29
4.0 Supporting Information	30
4.1. List of Preparers	30
4.2. Literature Cited	31



No Warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual use or aggregate use with other data, or for purposes not intended by the BLM. Spatial Information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This information is subject to change without notification.



0 0.325 0.65 1.3 Miles
April 8, 2016



1.0 Purpose and Need for Action

1.1 Introduction

The allottee on the South Brown Lake Allotment, Allotment Number 64018 has submitted a project proposal to construct 3.5 miles of pipeline, with one storage, and one drinker on the South Brown Lake allotment. This project would improve livestock grazing distribution and therefore improve or maintain the rangeland health of the grazing allotment.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Roswell Field Office will contract the pipeline and associated facilities installation, and will provide oversight during the construction of the pipeline, installation of the storage and drinking tub.

The federal permittee on this allotment will sign a Cooperative Range Improvement Agreement which will contain any additional mitigation measures that are developed as a result of the environmental assessment in addition to the standard stipulations established for pipeline construction on public land.

Preparing Office:
Pecos District, Roswell Field Office
2909 W. Second Street
Roswell, NM 88201

1.2 Purpose and Need for Action

The purpose and need for the action is established by BLM's responsibility to respond to an application for a range improvement in accordance with 43 CFR 4120.3-3(a) which in part states, "*Any permittee or lessee may apply for a range improvement permit to install, use, maintain, and/or modify removable range improvements that are needed to achieve management objectives for the allotment in which the permit or lease is held.*" The pipeline, storage and drinking tub construction and installation is needed to improve livestock distribution in order to ensure that the New Mexico Standards for Rangeland Health are being met on the allotment.

1.3 Decisions to be Made

The Decisions to be made upon the completion of this Environmental Assessment are: to authorize the pipeline, storage & tub (drinker) installation on Allotment 64018.

1.4 Conformance with Applicable Land Use Plan(s)

The proposed action conforms to the 1997 Roswell Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Record of Decision as amended; 2008 Special Status Species Resource Management Plan Amendment (2008 RMPA), and the 2000 New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management and Record of Decision as required by 43 CFR 1610.5 3.

1.5 Relationship to Statutes, Regulations or Other Plans

The construction of range improvements, either under Cooperative Agreement or Range Improvement Application is addressed under the 43 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 4100, Grazing Administration, Exclusive of Alaska, Subpart 4120.3.

The proposal to authorize range improvements on this allotment is in conformance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) (43 U.S.C. 1700 et seq.); the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 (TGA) (43 U.S.C. 315 et seq.); the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978 (PRIA) (43 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.); Federal Cave Resources Protection Act of 1988; The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

1.6 Scoping, Public Involvement, and Issues

Appropriate scoping helps identify issues, resources, and resource uses that could be impacted, reducing the chances of overlooking a potentially significant issue or reasonable alternative. Scoping takes place both internally within the BLM via meetings with resource specialists, as well as externally where the public is invited to comment.

The BLM's interdisciplinary team of resource specialists conducted internal scoping on the Proposed Action in November, 2015. After an initial review of the proposed action, the team decided that the project should be considered under the NEPA process.

2.0 Proposed Action and Alternative(s)

Under Alternative A, the proposed action is to authorize the construction of 3.5 miles of pipeline with one storage, and one drinker on public land within Allotment 64018.

The pipeline and facilities to be installed would provide a new and more reliable water distribution within the allotment.

The pipeline will connect to an existing location on private land in Section 7 lot 19 and proceed south south east, along an existing county road then following an existing "2-track road", crossing Sections 7, 18, 19 & 20 of Township 7 South, Range 21 East. The storage and the drinker will be located in the SE¼NE¼NE¼ Section 20, adjacent to an existing dirt tank. Another short segment of pipeline will be constructed, following the county road north to an existing pipeline which lays along the northern allotment boundary, in Section 7. The pipeline is currently planned to be supplied by water from a well on private land, in Lot 19, Section 7 or from the Brown Lake Well, located in T. 7 S., R. 21 E, Sec 7, lot 12. All portions of the pipeline constructed on private lands will be the responsibility of the landowner. Valves will be installed to allow water flow from either of the water supply wells.

All water facilities installed will be wildlife friendly and constructed to current BLM standards. The pipeline, storage and drinker will be constructed using the standard construction methods. These requirements would be written into the cooperative agreements as special conditions.

Table 1.1: Legal Description of Proposed Range Improvements	
Name	Public Land Legal Description
2017 Reynolds South Brown Lake Pipeline	Pipeline: Township 7 South, Range 21 East, Sections 7, 18, 19 & 20

See Attached Map.

Standard measures that will be included in the authorization for these projects are:

No blading will occur on public land, unless authorized by the Authorized Officer.

No road is authorized as a part of this project for construction or maintenance.

Gates or cattle guards will be installed on existing roads to ensure public access.

Brush will be cleared by hand with hand tools.

Water will be provided yearlong to all drinking tubs located on public land, for wildlife purposes, when livestock are not in the pasture. Wildlife escape ladders will be installed in all drinkers.

Livestock drinking tubs will not exceed 18" in height.

Vegetation, soil, and rocks left as a result of construction or maintenance activity shall be randomly scattered over the project area and shall not be left in rows, piles, or berms, unless otherwise approved by the Authorized Officer. A berm shall be left over the ditch line to allow for settling back to grade.

Non-galvanized storage tanks will be painted gray-green to blend with the environment.

The co-operator shall indemnify the United States against any liability for damage to life or property arising from the occupancy or use of public land under this authorization.

Any cultural and/or paleontological resource (historic or prehistoric site or object) discovered by the co-operator/contractor or any person working on the co-operator's/contractor behalf, on public or Federal land shall be immediately reported to the authorized officer. The co-operator/contractor shall suspend all operations in the immediate area of such discovery until written authorization to proceed is issued by the Authorized Officer. An evaluation of the discovery will be made by the authorized officer to determine appropriate actions to prevent the loss of significant cultural or scientific values. The co-operator/contractor shall be responsible for the cost of evaluation and any decision as to the proper mitigation measures will be made by the Authorized Officer after consulting with the co-operator/contractor.

The co-operator/contractor is hereby obligated to comply with procedures established in the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) to protect such cultural items as human remains, associated funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony discovered inadvertently during the course of the implementation. In the event that any of the cultural items listed above are discovered during the course of project work, the proponent shall immediately halt the disturbance and contact the BLM within 24 hours for instructions. The proponent or initiator of any project shall be held responsible for protecting, evaluating, reporting, excavating, treating, and disposing of these cultural items according to the procedures established by the BLM in consultation with Indian Tribes.

The co-operator/contractor shall be responsible for maintaining the site in a sanitary condition at all times; waste materials at those sites shall be disposed of promptly at an appropriate waste disposal site. "Waste" means all discarded matter including, but not limited to, human waste, trash, garbage, refuse, oil drums, petroleum products, ashes, and equipment.

The approval of the Permit/Agreement does not convey the right to prevent other lawful uses from occurring. The applicant/cooperator understands that other lawful users with proper authorizations may pass over, under, or through the range improvement authorized by the Permit/Agreement. Appropriate stipulations by the BLM to other users will protect the stability and purpose of this improvement.

Any cave or karst feature, such as a deep sinkhole, discovered by the co-operator/contractor or any person working on the co-operator's/contractor behalf, on BLM-managed public land shall be immediately reported to the authorized officer. An evaluation of the discovery will be made by the authorized officer to determine appropriate action(s). Any decision as to the further mitigation measures will be made by the Authorized Officer after consulting with the co-operator/contractor.

Due to the threat of White Nose Syndrome and in compliance with current cave closures, entry of any cave is not allowed without prior approval by the Roswell Field Manager.

2.1 Alternatives Considered by Not Analyzed in Detail

This alternative would re-route the entire proposed pipeline and location of storage or drinking tub. The alternatives would:

- add length to the pipeline;
- would cause more impact to the affected resources on the alternate route or
- would not be economical to install, maintain or use.

To re-route the pipeline would cause a concentration of the livestock use to one side of the pastures or the other. This alternative will not be given further consideration in this report; fewer environmental impacts would result from the action as proposed.

2.2 No Action Alternative

Under this alternative, the BLM would not authorize or approve the request to install 3.50 miles of pipeline, storage and drinking tub, on public land within Allotment 64018.

3.0 Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Cumulative Impacts

The No Action Alternative reflects the current situation within the project area and will serve as the baseline for comparing the environmental impacts of the analyzed alternatives.

During the analysis process, the interdisciplinary team considered several resources and supplemental authorities. The interdisciplinary team determined that the resources discussed below would be affected by the proposed action.

The following resources or values are not present or would not be affected by the authorization of livestock grazing on this allotment: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Prime or Unique Farmland, Minority/Low Income Populations, Public Health and Safety, Hazardous or Solid Wastes, Solid Mineral Resources, Fluid Mineral Resources, Recreation, Rights-of-Way, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and Wilderness.

Affected resources and the impacts resulting from the proposed range improvements are described below.

3.1 Soil / Water / Air

➤ Climate

Affected Environment

Climate is the composite of generally prevailing weather conditions of a particular region throughout the year, averaged over a series of years. GHG's and the potential effects of GHG emissions on climate are not regulated by the EPA, however climate has the potential to influence renewable and non-renewable resource management.

Greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄), and the potential effects of GHG emissions on climate, are not regulated by the EPA under the Clean Air Act. However, climate has the potential to influence renewable and non-renewable resource management. The EPA's Inventory of US Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks found that in 2006, total US GHG emissions were over 6 billion metric tons and that total US GHG emissions have increased by 14.1% from 1990 to 2006. The report also noted that GHG emissions fell by 1.5% from 2005 to 2006. This decrease was, in part, attributed to the increased use of natural gas and other alternatives to burning coal in electric power generation.

The levels of these GHGs are expected to continue increasing. The rate of increase is expected to slow as greater awareness of the potential environmental and economic costs associated with increased levels of GHG's result in behavioral and industrial adaptations.

Global mean surface temperatures have increased nearly 1.0°C (1.8°F) from 1890 to 2006 (Goddard Institute for Space Studies, 2007). However, observations and predictive models indicate that average temperature changes are likely to be greater in the Northern Hemisphere. Without additional meteorological monitoring systems, it is difficult to determine the spatial and temporal variability and

change of climatic conditions, but increasing concentrations of GHGs are likely to accelerate the rate of climate change.

In 2001, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predicted that by the year 2100, global average surface temperatures would increase 1.4 to 5.8°C (2.5 to 10.4°F) above 1990 levels. The National Academy of Sciences (2006) supports these predictions, but has acknowledged that there are uncertainties regarding how climate change may affect different regions. Computer model predictions indicate that increases in temperature will not be equally distributed, but are likely to be accentuated at higher latitudes. Warming during the winter months is expected to be greater than during the summer, and increases in daily minimum temperatures is more likely than increases in daily maximum temperatures.

A 2007 US Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report on Climate Change found that, "federal land and water resources are vulnerable to a wide range of effects from climate change, some of which are already occurring. These effects include, among others: 1) physical effects such as droughts, floods, glacial melting, and sea level rise; 2) biological effects, such as increases in insect and disease infestations, shifts in species distribution, and changes in the timing of natural events; and 3) economic and social effects, such as adverse impacts on tourism, infrastructure, fishing, and other resource uses." It is not, however, possible to predict with any certainty regional or site specific effects on climate relative to the proposed permitted allotment and subsequent actions.

In New Mexico, a recent study indicated that the mean annual temperatures have exceeded the global averages by nearly 50% since the 1970's (Enquist and Gori). Similar to trends in national data, increases in mean winter temperatures in the southwest have contributed to this rise. When compared to baseline information, periods between 1991 and 2005 show temperature increases in over 95% of the geographical area of New Mexico. Warming is greatest in the northwestern, central, and southwestern parts of the state.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Climate change analyses are comprised of several factors, including greenhouse gases (GHGs), land use management practices, the albino effect, etc. The tools necessary to quantify climatic impacts from the Proposed Action are presently unavailable. As a consequence, impact assessment of specific effects of anthropogenic activities cannot be determined. Additionally, specific levels of significance have not yet been established. Therefore, climate change analysis for the purpose of this document is limited to accounting and disclosing of factors that may contribute to climate change. Qualitative and/or quantitative evaluation of potential contributing factors within the planning area is included where appropriate and practicable.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

There will be no direct or indirect impacts to climate if a no action alternative is selected.

Cumulative Impacts of all Alternatives

The incremental impact of the pipeline, storage and drinker construction project on climate resources must be analyzed in the context of impacts from other actions. Other BLM actions that could have impacts on the identified resources include: structural range improvement construction projects on other allotments in this area; oil and gas activities on the uplands; rights-of way crossing the area; and recreation use, particularly off-highway vehicles. All authorized activities which occur on BLM land can also take place on state and private land.

Many of the actions which could contribute to cumulative impacts have occurred over many years. Impacts from open-range livestock grazing in the last century are still being addressed today. Oil and gas activities began in the early part of the 20th century. These activities are still occurring today, and are expected to continue into the foreseeable future to some degree.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

A rangeland health assessment has been completed and the allotment meets the Standards for Public Land Health. Rangeland monitoring would help ensure that adequate vegetation cover is maintained to protect the soil from erosion which would decrease dust levels resulting from allotment management activities.

➤ Soils

Affected Environment

The Soil Conservation Service, now the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), has surveyed the soils in Chaves County. Complete soil information is available in the Soil Survey of Chaves County, Northern Part, New Mexico, (USDA Soil Conservation Service 1980) and online at <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>. The soil map units represented in the project area are:

Threadgill-Asparas association, gently sloping (TAB) –This association is on alluvial side slopes and in upland valleys. Slopes are from 0 to 5 percent. The soils in this association are deep and well drained. Runoff is medium. Available water capacity is very high. Permeability is moderately slow. The hazard of water erosion is moderate and the hazard of soil blowing is high.

Pastura – Darvey association, moderately undulating (PDB) –This unit is found on plateaus with slopes of 0 to 5 percent. The association varies from shallow to deep; and are well drained. Permeability is moderate with available water capacity varies from very low to very high. Runoff is medium to rapid. The hazard of water erosion is moderate to high. The hazard of soil blowing is high.

Deama-Pastura association, moderately rolling (DPC) –This unit is found on uplands with slopes of 0 to 15 percent. The soils are shallow and well drained. Runoff is moderate to rapid and permeability is moderate. The hazard of water erosion is moderate to high and the hazard of soil blowing varies from slight to high.

Ector very cobbly loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes (EaC) –This is a shallow, well drained soil on the uplands. Permeability of the soil is moderate. Available water capacity is very low. Runoff is rapid and the hazard of water erosion is high. The hazard of soil blowing is slight.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

The construction of the project would physically disturb topsoil during the placement of the pipeline, storage and drinker. Direct impacts resulting from the construction of the project include removal of vegetation along the pipeline, exposure of the soil, compaction by livestock trailing along the new pipeline, loss of top soil productivity and susceptibility to wind and water erosion. Wind erosion would be expected to be a minor contributor to soil erosion with the possible exception of dust from vehicle traffic. These impacts could result in increased indirect impacts such as runoff, erosion and off-site sedimentation.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

There will be no direct or indirect impacts to soils if the no action alternative is selected.

Cumulative Impacts

There will be no cumulative impacts to soils if a no action alternative is selected.

Roads, fences, stock trails and water well development have occurred in the past and may contribute to the cumulative impacts of the area. This is in addition to oil and gas field development in the area. The proposed actions will not contribute significantly to the cumulative impacts of the area.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

A rangeland health assessment has been completed and the allotment meets the Standards for Public Land Health. Rangeland monitoring would help ensure that adequate vegetation cover is maintained to protect the soil from erosion which would decrease dust levels resulting from allotment management activities. The disturbed area should naturally re-vegetate within two growing seasons or less with adequate precipitation, resulting in cessation of project related erosion or runoff.

➤ Air Quality

Affected Environment

BLM is required to comply with the Clean Air Act, as amended, and State Implementation Plans. The proposed area has not been identified as a non-attainment area. Additionally, throughout most of the year the air quality throughout Chaves County is very good and is considered clean. Air quality will be temporarily impacted only during the dry spring months, windstorms and blowing dust can become a problem throughout the area.

The area of the proposed action is considered a Class II air quality area. A Class II area allows moderate amounts air quality degradation. The primary sources of air pollution are dust from blowing wind on disturbed or exposed soil and exhaust emissions from motorized equipment.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Air quality would temporary be directly impacted with pollution from exhaust emissions, chemical odors, and dust that would be caused by the motorized equipment used to construct the project. Dust dissemination would discontinue upon completion of the construction phases of the project. Air pollution from the motorized equipment would discontinue at the completion of the project. The winds that frequent the southeastern part of New Mexico generally disperse the odors and emissions. The impacts to air quality would be greatly reduced as the construction of the project is completed. Other factors that currently affect air quality in the area include dust from livestock herding activities, dust from recreational use, and dust from use of roads for vehicular traffic.

There would be some impact to air resources in the short term resulting from construction activities. The construction activities would cause temporary increase in dust concentrations in construction areas. The use of standard construction dust mitigation procedures would help control emissions.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

There will be no direct or indirect impacts to air quality if a no action alternative is selected.

Cumulative Impacts of all Alternatives

There will be no cumulative impacts to air quality if a no action alternative is selected.

The incremental impact of the pipeline project on climate resources must be analyzed in the context of impacts from other actions. Other BLM actions that could have impacts on the identified resources include: structural range improvement construction projects on other allotments in this area; oil and gas activities on the uplands; rights-of way crossing the area; and recreation use, particularly off-highway vehicles. All authorized activities which occur on BLM land can also take place on state and private land.

Many of the actions which could contribute to cumulative impacts have occurred over many years. Impacts from open-range livestock grazing in the last century are still being addressed today. Oil and gas activities began in the early part of the 20th century. These activities are still occurring today, and are expected to continue into the foreseeable future to some degree.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

A rangeland health assessment has been completed and the allotment meets the Standards for Public Land Health. Rangeland monitoring would help ensure that adequate vegetation cover is maintained to

protect the soil from erosion which would decrease dust levels resulting from allotment management activities.

➤ Watershed Hydrology

Affected Environment

The watershed and hydrology in the area is affected by land and water use practices. The degree to which hydrologic processes are affected by land and water use depends on the location, extent, timing and the type of activity. Factors that currently cause short-lived alterations to the hydrologic regime in the area include livestock grazing management, recreational use activities, groundwater pumping and also oil and gas developments such as well pads, permanent roads, temporary roads, pipelines, and power lines.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Construction and surface disturbance activities from construction of the project can result in long and short-term alterations to hydrologic regime. Peak and low flow of perennial streams, ephemeral, and intermittent rivers and streams would be directly affected by an increase in impervious surfaces resulting from construction of this pipeline project. Potential hydrologic effects to peak flow is reduced infiltration where surface flows can move more quickly to perennial or ephemeral rivers and streams, causing peak flow to occur earlier and be larger. Increased magnitude and volume of peak flow can cause bank erosion, channel widening, downward incision, and disconnection from the floodplain. Potential hydrologic effects to low flow is reduced surface storage and groundwater recharge, resulting in reduced baseflow to perennial, ephemeral, and intermittent rivers and streams. Direct impacts would be that hydrologic processes may be altered where perennial, ephemeral, and intermittent river and stream systems respond by changing physical parameters, such as channel configuration. These changes may in turn impact chemical parameters and ultimately the aquatic ecosystem.

Long-term direct and indirect impacts to watershed and hydrology would continue for the life of the project and would decrease once natural re-vegetation of the project has taken place. Short-term direct and indirect impacts to the watershed and hydrology from the pipeline project would occur and would likely decrease in time due to natural re-vegetation. The disturbed area should naturally re-vegetate within two growing seasons or less with adequate precipitation.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

There will be no direct or indirect impacts to watershed hydrology if a no action alternative is selected.

Cumulative Impacts

There will be no cumulative impacts to watershed hydrology if a no action alternative is selected.

Roads, fences, stock trails and water well development have occurred in the past and may contribute to the cumulative impacts to watershed hydrology in the area. This is in addition to oil and gas field development in the area. The proposed actions will not contribute significantly to the cumulative impacts to watershed hydrology in the area.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

No new roads would be authorized as a part of this project for construction or maintenance. No blading would occur on public land, unless authorized by the Authorized Officer. Brush would be cleared by hand with hand tools. Vegetation, soil and rocks left as a result of construction or maintenance activity would be randomly scattered over the project area and would not be left in rows, piles or berms, unless otherwise approved by the Authorized Officer.

The disturbed area should naturally re-vegetate within two growing seasons or less with adequate precipitation.

➤ Water Quality - Surface

Affected Environment

Surface: Surface water within the area is affected by geology, precipitation and water erosion. Factors that currently affect surface water resources include livestock grazing management, recreational use and brush control treatments. Ephemeral surface water within the area may be located in tributaries, playas, alkali lakes and stock tanks. No perennial surface water is found on public land in this area.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Potential impacts to water resources during construction would be primarily associated with surface disturbing activities, but could also be a result of accidental spills and handling and storage of hazardous chemicals.

Use of construction equipment would cause compaction of near surface soils that could result in increased runoff and, subsequently, increased sedimentation. Clearing and grading during construction would expose the soils to erosion. Construction activities could also temporarily alter the overland flow and consequently the groundwater recharge patterns. The alteration of the natural soils strata by earthworks could reduce the soils ability to absorb water resulting in ponding and/or alter existing groundwater pathways for groundwater. These effects, if they occurred, would be temporary and minor.

Potential direct impacts that would occur due to construction of the project include increased surface water runoff and off-site sedimentation brought about by soil disturbance and increased salt loading and water quality impairment of surface waters. The magnitude of these impacts to water resources would depend on the proximity of the disturbance to the drainage, channel, slope aspect and gradient, degree and area of soil disturbance, soil character, duration and time within which construction activity would occur, and the timely implementation and success or failure of mitigation measures.

Direct impacts would likely be greatest shortly after the start of construction activities and would likely decrease in time due to natural stabilization, and reclamation efforts. Construction activities would occur over a relatively short period; therefore, the majority of the disturbance would be intense but short lived. Direct impacts to surface water quality would be minor, short-term impacts which may occur during storm flow events.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

There will be no direct or indirect impacts to surface water quality if a no action alternative is selected.

Cumulative Impacts

There will be no cumulative impacts to surface water quality if a no action alternative is selected.

Roads, fences, stock trails and water well development have occurred in the past and may contribute to the cumulative impacts to surface water quality in the area. This is in addition to oil and gas field development in the area. The proposed actions will not contribute significantly to the cumulative impacts to surface water quality in the area.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

A rangeland health assessment has been completed and the allotment meets the Standards for Public Land Health. Rangeland monitoring would help ensure that adequate vegetation cover is maintained to protect the soil from erosion which would decrease dust levels resulting from allotment management activities. The disturbed area should naturally re-vegetate within two growing seasons or less with adequate precipitation, resulting in cessation of project related erosion or runoff.

➤ Water Quality - Ground

Affected Environment

Ground: Groundwater within this area is affected by geology and precipitation. Factors that currently affect groundwater resources in this area include livestock grazing management, groundwater pumping and possible impacts from brush control treatments. The approximate depth to groundwater ranges from 600 to 650 feet in the area (New Mexico Office of the State Engineer Data).

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Potential impacts to water resources during construction would be primarily associated with surface disturbing activities, but could also be a result of accidental spills and handling and storage of hazardous chemicals. The alteration of the natural soils strata by earthworks could reduce the soils ability to absorb water resulting in ponding and/or alter existing groundwater pathways for groundwater. These effects, if they occurred, would be temporary and minor.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

There will be no direct or indirect impacts to ground water quality if a no action alternative is selected.

Cumulative Impacts

Roads, fences, stock trails and water well development have occurred in the past and may contribute to the cumulative impacts to groundwater in the area. This is in addition to oil and gas field development in the area. The proposed actions will not contribute significantly to the cumulative impacts to groundwater in the area.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

A rangeland health assessment has been completed and the allotment meets the Standards for Public Land Health. Rangeland monitoring would help ensure that adequate vegetation cover is maintained to protect the soil from erosion which would decrease dust levels resulting from allotment management activities. The disturbed area should naturally re-vegetate within two growing seasons or less with adequate precipitation, resulting in cessation of project related erosion or runoff.

3.2 Archaeology

➤ Cultural and Historical Resource

Affected Environment

The allotment falls within the Southeastern New Mexico Archaeological Region. This region contains the following cultural/temporal periods: Paleoindian (ca. 12,000-8,000 B.C.), Archaic (ca. 8000 B.C. –A.D. 950), Ceramic (ca. A.D. 600-1540) Protohistoric and Spanish Colonial (ca. A.D. 1400-1821), and Mexican and American Historical (ca. A.D. 1822 to early 20th century). Sites representing any or all of these periods are known to occur within the region. A more complete discussion can be found in *Living on the Land: 11,000 Years of Human Adaptation in Southeastern New Mexico; An Overview of Cultural Resources in the Roswell District*, Bureau of Land Management published in 1989 by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management.

A cultural resource inventory was conducted for the area of effect (16-040A). No historic properties were identified.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

There will be no direct or indirect impacts to cultural resources if the Proposed Action Alternative is selected.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

There will be no direct or indirect impacts to cultural resources if a no action alternative is selected.

Cumulative Impacts

No cumulative impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

There are no mitigation measures at this time.

➤ Native American Religious Concerns

Affected Environment

Native American groups may have places that can be described as Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) or sacred sites that are important to their religions or cultures. The BLM uses the New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs list of tribes/nations/pueblos concerned for individual counties to determine which of these groups may have concerns for the area. Additionally, the BLM conducts tribal consultation for many projects while preparing planning documents, such as, the Resource Management Plan and Resource Management Plan Addendums. To date, the areas to be affected have not been identified by interested tribes as being of concern.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated if the Proposed Action Alternative is selected.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated if the No Action Alternative is selected.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts are not anticipated.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

There are no mitigation measures at this time.

3.3 Range

➤ Vegetation

Affected Environment

The proposed location for the pipeline, storage and drinking tub falls within two major community types; the Grassland Community and the Mixed Desert Shrub Community.

In the Grassland Community is generally flat to moderately rolling topography with 75 percent and higher composition of grasses in the description of potential plant community.

Grassland is the climax vegetative aspect for large portions of the resource area. The grassland community type is the most widespread. It can be further subdivided into grass rolling upland, grass hill, grass flat, and mesquite grassland subtypes, depending on topographic relief or seral stage. In many areas the subtypes may overlap. Vegetation is primarily dominated by warm season short- and midgrasses. Large areas of grassland climax communities have dropped in successional stage due to misuse and have become a dis-climax mixed shrub community.

The grass rolling uplands is the predominant shortgrass habitat subtype in the resource area. It is found on broad, nearly level or gently undulating plains to rolling hills at elevations between 3800 feet to 5000 feet. Slopes are 0 to 9 percent. Vegetation is dominated by blue grama, black grama, galleta, tobosa, sideoats grama, dropseeds, muhlys, threeawns, burrograss and fluffgrass.

Woody shrub species are scarce but include mesquite, fourwing saltbush, wolfberry, sumac, and cactus species such as yucca and cholla. Invasions of broom snakeweed, a halfshrub, are common in some areas. Forbs are a minor component of the subtype except following periods of rainfall. Ground cover may be too sparse in much of this subtype to provide the cover requirements of certain small mammals or ground-nesting birds.

Grass hills are found primarily on hills, low mountains, or lower foot slopes of higher mountains. Slopes are rolling to steep and average about 25 percent. Elevations range from 4500 feet to 6000 feet. Short- and mid-grasses dominate this subtype, including hairy grama, fluffgrass, three-awn, and red lovegrass. Shrubs, halfshrubs and cacti include little leaf sumac, beargrass, ocotillo, hedgehog cactus, cholla and broom snakeweed. The structured diversity of the vegetation in this subtype provides more diverse bird nesting habitat than adjacent grasslands. This is the preferred habitat for mule deer, which also use the brushy draws for browse and cover.

The grass flats subtype occurs on nearly level to gently sloping upland plains as broad swales between uplands, or as isolated pockets in shallow depressions, playas, along drainages or in sinks. These areas receive significant runoff from adjacent sites, which produces more dense and taller vegetation. Vegetation is dominated by mid- and tall-grasses with occasional shrubs or half shrubs. The primary grasses are tobosa and galleta, which may occur on large expanses between upland sites, and alkali and giant sacaton, which usually are found along drainages or in depressions. Shrubs sparsely associated with the sacaton type are mesquite and fourwing saltbush. A few scattered yuccas or cholla may be interspersed in the tobosa swales. Forb diversity and abundance is low due to the density of the grass cover.

The mesquite grassland type could best be described as a dis-climax stage in a desert shortgrass climax. The mesquite invasion results from disturbance of natural successional processes. The type is generally located between the grassy plains and the Pecos River, including the breaks adjacent to the floodplain. Terrain is level to gently undulating with slopes generally less than 5 percent, or hummocky with numerous sand dunes scattered throughout the area. The elevation varies from 3,000 feet to 6,000 feet.

Mesquite is found on most soil types, but the main invasion occurs on sandy soils. The predominant shrub is honey mesquite, which has invaded what at one time was a shortgrass dominated type. Few other shrub species are associated with mesquite, although some creosote, yucca and Opuntia occur.

Vegetation is dominated by black grama, blue grama, dropseed, muhly, tobosa and galleta, fluffgrass, and alkali sacaton on undulating terrain, with higher percentages of dropseed, three-awn and muhly on sandy sites. Halfshrubs include sand sage and broom snakeweed. Forbs may be abundant following periods of rainfall.

Grasslands is the most widespread of the community types found in the resource area. Approximately 30 percent (149) of the wildlife species found in the resource area use this community type.

The primary consideration in listing range sites under the Mixed Desert Shrub community type is topography influenced by drainages, fans, and mesas with shrubs and halfshrubs comprising from 10 to 35 percent of the potential plant community.

The mixed desert shrub type occurs from gently sloping, undulating terrain to breaks and escarpments which are rough, broken and dissected by drainages. Elevations range from 2,500 feet to 4,100 feet. This type is found scattered throughout the resource area intermingled with a short- or mid-grass habitat type.

Vegetation in this community is somewhat sparse and is comprised of desert grasses, shrubs and cacti. Forbs can become abundant following periods of rainfall. The predominant shrub species include creosote, mesquite, tarbush, saltbush, little leaf sumac, and sage. Common cacti encountered are claret cup, cholla, prickly pear and eagle claw. Forbs include plantain, globe mallow, and buckwheat. Grasses include fluffgrass, sideoats grama, black grama, dropseed and galleta.

The project will be located predominately within four ecological ranges sites: Loamy CP-3, Shallow CP-3, Shallow Limestone CP-3 and Very Shallow CP-4.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Short term negative impacts would include vegetation disturbance that will be localized to the immediate area of the project. Vegetation will be destroyed where the pipeline is constructed, but the disturbed area will naturally re-vegetate within two growing seasons with adequate precipitation. Approximately 21.2 acres of vegetation on public land will be subject to disturbance during the construction of the pipeline (based on 3.5 miles * 50 ft. width). Positive long term impacts would include vegetation benefits due to the reduced stress caused by foraging animals. This will lead to more even utilization rates across the allotment.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Under the No Action Alternative, the pipeline, storage and drinking tub would not be installed, and the associated impacts of that construction would not occur.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed action would not contribute significantly to the cumulative impacts of the area. The results of the proposed action will not substantially change the plant and animal communities of the project area.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

No additional mitigating measures will be needed if the standard operation procedures and design features previously discussed are adhered to.

Implementation of the proposed action would have potential for unavoidable temporary adverse environmental impacts.

➤ Livestock Grazing

Affected Environment

The South Brown Lake Allotment 64018 is permitted to be grazed yearlong by cattle, sheep and horses. The permit for the allotment authorizes 164 Animal Units (AUs). This is an “controlled” allotment, meaning the total of number of stock on the allotment, are limited.

The allotment contains about 4,095 acres of public land (see Location Map), and 1,743 acres of private and state leased land. Public landownership is intermingled with private land. Current range improvement projects for the management of livestock include earthen tanks, wells, and drinking troughs, pasture and boundary fences and corrals.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Under Alternative A, Proposed Action Alternative, no increase in AUMs will result. Grazing systems dependent on existing and new pasture configuration will benefit by the additional flexibility and reliability provided by the new water location.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Under the No Action Alternative, the pipeline, storage and drinking tub would not be installed. Grazing systems would remain as they are.

Cumulative Impacts

The incremental impact of authorizing range improvements must be analyzed in the context of impacts from other actions. Other BLM actions that could have impacts on the identified resources include: livestock authorization on other allotments in the area, oil and gas activities on the uplands, rights-of-way crossing the area and recreational use, particularly off-highway vehicles. All authorized activities which occur on BLM land can also take place on state or private lands.

Many of the actions which could contribute to cumulative impacts have occurred over many years. Impacts from open-range livestock grazing in the last century are still being addressed today. Oil and gas activity began in the early part of the 20th century. These activities are still occurring today, and are expected to continue into the foreseeable future.

The analysis of cumulative impacts is driven by major resource issues. The proposed action is the authorization of pipeline construction on South Brown Lake, Allotment 64018. The cumulative impacts to this allotment and adjacent allotments are insignificant.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

No additional mitigating measures will be needed.

➤ Invasive, Non-Native Species

Affected Environment

A noxious weed is defined as a plant that causes disease or has other adverse effects on the human environment and is, therefore, detrimental to the public health and to the agriculture and commerce of the United States. Generally noxious weeds are aggressive, difficult to manage, parasitic, are carriers or hosts of harmful insects or disease, and are either native, new to, or not common, the United States. In most cases, noxious weeds are non-native species.

The list currently includes the following weeds: 1) African rue (*Peganum harmala*), 2) black henbane (*Hyoscyamus niger*), 3) bull thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*), 4) camelthorn (*Alhagi pseudalhagi*),

5) Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), 6) dalmatian toadflax (*Linaria genistifolia* ssp. *Dalmatica*), 7) goldenrod, (*Solidago Canadensis*) 8) leafy spurge (*Euphorbia esula*), 9) Malta starthistle (*Centaurea melitensis*), 10) musk thistle (*Carduus nutans*), 11) poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), 12) purple starthistle (*Centaurea calcitrapa*), 13) Russian knapweed (*Centaurea repens*), 14) Scotch thistle (*Onopordum acanthium*), 15) spotted knapweed (*Centaurea maculosa*), 16) teasel (*Dipsacus fullonum*), 17) yellow starthistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), 18) yellow toadflax (*Linaria vulgaris*), 19) Russian olive (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*), 20) Saltcedar (*Tamarix* spp.), 21) Siberian elm (*Ulmus pumila*).

Of the noxious weeds listed, the ones with known populations in the Roswell Field Office are African rue, non-native thistles (*Cirsium* spp.) such as bull thistle and Canada thistle, leafy spurge, poison hemlock, teasel, musk thistle, goldenrod, Malta starthistle, Russian knapweed, tamarix species, Siberian elm, Russian olive and Scotch thistle. Also "problem weeds" of local concern are cocklebur (*Xanthium* spp.), buffalobur (*Curcubita foetidissima*) and spiny cocklebur (*Xanthium spinosum*). "Problem weeds" are those weeds which may be native to the area but whose populations are out of balance with other local flora. Infestations of noxious weeds can have a disastrous impact on biodiversity and natural ecosystems. Further, noxious weeds can negatively affect livestock and dairy producers by increasing their feed and animal health care costs. Increased costs to operators are eventually borne by consumers. Noxious weeds also affect recreational uses, and reduce realty values of both directly influenced and adjacent properties.

Recent federal legislation has been enacted requiring state and county agencies to implement noxious weed control programs using funds generated from the federal tax base. Therefore, all citizens and taxpayers of the United States are directly affected when noxious weed control prevention is not exercised.

There are no known populations of noxious weeds within the boundaries of Allotment 64018.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Noxious weeds affect both crops and native plant species in the same way, by out-competing for light, water and soil nutrients. Losses are attributed to decreased quality and quantity of agricultural products due to high levels of competition from noxious weeds and infestations. Noxious weeds can negatively affect livestock productivity by making forage unpalatable to livestock thus decreasing livestock productivity and potentially increasing producer's feed costs.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

While the vector of construction equipment would be removed under this alternative, noxious weed populations would still have the potential to become established, generally through vehicular traffic or seed movement carried by wildlife, wind or dust. Once established, noxious weeds would compete with the vegetation, reducing the habitat for wildlife.

Cumulative Impacts

Infestations of noxious weeds can have a potentially disastrous impact on biodiversity and natural ecosystems. In order to combat the negative effects of noxious weeds on crop lands, grazing lands and waterways, herbicidal and other weed control strategies can be implemented at further costs to producers and government agencies. Such costs would then likely be passed down to consumers, who would pay more for products due to increased producer costs.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

There is an opportunity for noxious weeds to become established within the proposed range improvement route. Noxious weeds could be introduced by the equipment used for construction of the pipeline and placement of the storage and drinking tub. Monitoring the area after installation will be conducted to ensure that weeds do not become established. If new populations are discovered, they will be aggressively treated.

3.4 Wildlife Biology

➤ Wildlife

Affected Environment

The range of wildlife habitat include open gently undulating grasslands, rolling limestone hills with shrubby species and various sizes of draws and swales that may also support large woody species such as hackberry and black walnut. Special habitat features include karst features, scattered trees and water developments. The diversity and abundance of wildlife species in the area is due to the presence of a mixture of grassland habitat and mixed desert shrub vegetation.

Common bird species are mourning dove, mockingbird, white-crowned sparrow, black-throated sparrow, blue grosbeak, western meadowlark, western kingbird, common nighthawk, loggerhead shrike, and roadrunner. Raptors include northern harrier, Swainson's hawk, American kestrel, and occasionally bald and golden eagle during the winter months.

Common mammal species using the area include desert mule deer, pronghorn, coyote, gray fox, bobcat, striped skunk, porcupine, raccoon, badger, jackrabbit, cottontail, white-footed mouse, deer mouse, grasshopper mouse, kangaroo rat, spotted ground squirrel, and woodrat. Resident bats in the area are Townsend's Western Big-eared (*Corynorhinus townsendii*), Cave Bat (*Myotis velifer*) and Small-footed Bat (*Myotis celiolabrum*). None of these bat species are threatened or endangered.

A variety of herptiles also occur in the area such as yellow mud turtle, box turtle, eastern fence lizard, side-blotched lizard, horned lizard, whiptail, hognose snake, coachwhip, gopher snake, rattlesnake, and spadefoot toad.

This allotment is within the Macho Wildlife Habitat Area (WHA) with management emphasis on pronghorn antelope and wintering raptors. The present distribution of pronghorn antelope varies

within the Macho WHA from the inability of pronghorn to move freely across their historical range. Movement patterns and distribution is affected by net-wire fences associated with sheep ranching.

On this specific allotment, re-introduction efforts in coordination with the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish have been conducted in the 1980's along with fence modifications installed by the BLM in cooperation with the allottee to improve the abundance and distribution of pronghorn antelope on the ranch. There is continued potential for maintaining habitat with respect to pronghorn movement due to mostly cattle grazing on the allotment that would allow for the construction of wildlife-friendly fences such as 4-strand barbed wire design versus netwire fences.

Special Status Species, Including Threatened and Endangered Species:

There are no known threatened or endangered species of plant or animals on Allotment 64018. A list of federal threatened, endangered and candidate species reviewed for this EA can be found in Appendix 11 of the Roswell Approved RMP (AP11-2). There are no designated critical habitat areas within this allotment. Habitat for wintering bald eagles would not have significant negative impacts by the proposed action, and continued livestock grazing, since riparian habitats and suitable or active roosting sites are present in the nearby areas.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

There would be short-term disruptions to wildlife during the installation phase of the pipeline and storage. Since the storage and drinker would be located in the vicinity of an existing earthen tank area, impacts from new developments would be insignificant. No additional mitigating measures would be needed if the standard operating procedures and design features are adhered to.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Wildlife would not benefit from year round water sources but pasture size would remain viable for pronghorn antelope populations.

Cumulative Impacts

Permanent sources of water primarily developed for livestock would contribute to grazing pressure spread throughout the allotment.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

Tire drinkers will be set at the 20" minimum standard for wildlife and equipped with wildlife escape ramps. Residual impacts from the developments on wildlife and habitat would need to be evaluated at a later date and would be dependent on grazing practices over time. It is expected that with proper grazing management that the improvements, permanent waters, would benefit wildlife in the long term.

3.5 Visual Resources

Affected Environment

The landscape at the location is flat with rolling hills. The affected environment presents a winter gray color pattern and in warm months, with foliage, a gray to gray-green color pattern. Wide-area landscape tends to be horizontal in line and flat in form, with a smooth texture.

The VRM attributes of form, line, color, texture are:

Form – flat to rolling

Line – generally horizontal

Color – brownish-grey in winter and grey-green in summer

Texture – smooth to the horizon.

The proposed action is located in an area designated VRM Class IV.

Class IV for visual resources management - VRM objective provide for management activities which require major modification of the existing landscape character...every attempt, however, should be made to reduce or eliminate activity impacts through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeating the basic landscape elements.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

The basic landscape elements of form, line color and texture would not change under any management alternative. Potential impacts to visual resources would be analyzed and mitigated as allotment management activities are proposed in the future. The most significant impact to VRM is the placement of the tanks on the landscape. To blend favorably with the setting, tanks would be painted a grey-green color.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

The basic landscape elements of form, line color and texture would not change under any management alternative. Tanks, pipeline, and troughs installed under the proposed action would not be present under the no action alternative and thus create no additional impact.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative adverse visual impacts can thus be avoided by moving to the more appropriate vegetative/landform setting color scheme, such as Oil Green.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

Through color manipulation, by painting tanks to blend with the rolling to flat vegetative and/or landform setting with a gray-green color, the view is expected to favorably blend with the form, line, color and texture of the existing landscape. The flat color **Oil Green** from the Standard Environmental Supplemental Colors (March 2007) also closely approximates the grey to grey-green setting. All facilities would be painted this color. The paint formula is 17-0115 TPX (Pantone for Architecture and Interior Colors Guide 2003).

3.6 Cave and Karst

Affected Environment


This proposed project is located in gypsum karst terrain, a landform that is characterized by underground drainage through solutionally enlarged conduits. Gypsum karst terrain may contain sinkholes, sinking streams, caves, and springs. Sinkholes leading to underground drainages and voids are common. These karst features, as well as occasional fissures and discontinuities in the bedrock, provide the primary sources for rapid recharge of the groundwater aquifers of the region.

The BLM categorizes all areas within the Roswell Field Office as having either low, medium, high cave potential based on geology, occurrence of known caves, density of karst features, and potential impacts to fresh water aquifers. This project occurs within a **High Karst Zone**. A High karst zone is defined as an area in known soluble rock types and contains a high frequency of significant caves and karst features such as sinkholes, bedrock fractures that provide rapid recharge of karst aquifers, and springs that provide riparian habitat.

Unknown features may also exist. Due to these factors, this action is subject to mitigation measures designed to adequately protect known and potential cave/karst resources.

Sinkholes and cave entrances collect water and can accumulate rich organic materials and soils. This, in conjunction with the stable microclimate near cave entrances, support a greater diversity and density of plant life which provides habitat for a greater diversity and density of wildlife such as raptors, rodents, mammals, and reptiles.

The interior of the caves support a large variety of troglobitic, or cave environment-dependent species. The troglobitic species have adapted specifically to the cave environment due to constant temperatures, constant high humidity, and total darkness. Some of the caves in the area contain bat colonies. Many of the caves in this area contain fragile cave formations known as speleothems.



Sinkhole Development (http://geoinfo.nmt.edu/tour/state/bottomless_lakes/home.html)

White Nose Syndrome and Identified Hibernacula

Many Roswell Field Office caves are identified or potential hibernation sites and are optimum sites for White Nose Syndrome (WNS) establishment. Any karst area north of Roswell is subject to this situation. While WNS is still 500 miles from the area, it is still of great concern to the bat population in this area. White Nose Syndrome was first documented on hibernating bats at Howe caverns in 2006 in New York and by 2014 it had moved over across 27 eastern and southern states, Washington State, and 5 Canadian provinces, and has killed well over 7 million bats. Infection is definitely bat-to-bat and humans may possibly transport the spores, though to date there has been no conclusive evidence of human vector

<http://whitenosesyndrome.org/> &

<http://static.whitenosesyndrome.org/sites/default/files/resource/wnshumantransmissionposter.pdf>

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Cave and karst features provide direct conduits leading to groundwater. These conduits can quickly transport surface and subsurface contaminants directly into underground water systems and freshwater aquifers without filtration or biodegradation. In addition, contaminants spilled or leaked into or onto cave/karst zone surfaces and subsurfaces may lead directly to the disruption, displacement, or extermination of cave species and critical biological processes.

In cave and karst terrains, rainfall and surface runoff is directly channeled into natural underground water systems and aquifers. Changes in geologic formation integrity, runoff quantity/quality, drainage course, rainfall percolation factors, vegetation, surface contour, and other surface factors can negatively impact cave ecosystems and aquifer recharge processes. Blasting, heavy vibrations, and focusing of

surface drainages can lead to slow subsidence, sudden collapse of subsurface voids, and/or cave ecosystem damage.

BLM maintains up to date locations and surveys of known cave and karst features. Projects will be located away from these features whenever possible. Structural range improvements such as fences or pipelines will be routed around cave and karst features at an adequate distance to mitigate adverse impacts

Highly sensitive cave and karst areas with critical freshwater aquifer recharge concerns may have a number of special surface and subsurface planning and construction requirements based upon the risk of adverse impacts created by a specific location or process.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to cave and karst resources would occur on public lands if the construction of the tubs, storage and associated pipeline did not occur.

Cumulative Impacts

The incremental impact of authorizing surface disturbing impacts on cave and karst resources must be analyzed in the context of impacts from cumulative actions. Other BLM actions that could have impacts on the identified resources include: livestock authorization on other allotments in the area, oil and gas activities on the uplands, rights-of-way crossing the area and recreational use, particularly off-highway vehicles. All authorized activities which occur on BLM land can also take place on state or private lands.

The analysis of cumulative impacts is driven by major resource issues. The proposed action is the construction of a pipeline, tanks and trough on this allotment. The cumulative impacts to cave and karst resources from the construction of this project are minimal.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

Livestock grazing could be affected by the presence of karst features if livestock became entrapped in deep sinkholes, which has occurred with sheep grazing on karst land north of Roswell. This could be prevented by creating exclosures around identified karst features that pose a hazard to livestock. In the event that range improvement projects are proposed, the presence of karst features would be further analyzed in related environmental assessments.

If new information surfaces that livestock grazing is negatively impacting cave and karst resources, action will be taken at that time to migrate those impacts.

3.7 Paleontology

Affected Environment

The BLM manages paleontological resources for their scientific, educational, and recreational values in compliance with the Paleontological Resources Preservation Act (PRPA) of 2009. The PRPA affirms the authority for many of the policies the Federal land managing agencies already have in place for the management of paleontological resources such as issuing permits for collecting paleontological resources, curation of paleontological resources, and confidentiality of locality data. The statute provides authority for the protection of paleontological resources on Federal lands including criminal and civil penalties for fossil theft and vandalism.

The BLM classifies geologic formations to indicate the likelihood of significant fossil occurrence (usually vertebrate fossils of scientific interest) according to the Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) System for Paleontological Resources on Public Lands (IM 2008-011). These classifications, Classes 1 to 5, determine the procedures to be followed prior to granting a paleontological clearance to proceed with a project.

All paleontological resource stipulations will be followed as indicated in the attached COAs. These stipulations may include, but are not limited to, altering the location or scope of the project, permanent fencing or other physical, temporary barriers, monitoring of earth disturbing construction, project area reduction or specific construction avoidance zones, and fossil recovery. If the assessment of a proposed action indicates a reasonable expectation of adverse impacts to significant paleontological resources, a field survey will be necessary to properly document and recover any fossil material and associated data. Upon review, a determination for final project clearance and stipulations shall be issued by the BLM RFO.

Most of the project area is designated as a Class 3 area (San Andres Formation). Ground disturbing activities are not likely to disturb paleontological resources in this area.

Impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

The Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) data indicate the Proposed Action is within an area designated as Class 3. The Proposed Action would not affect any known scientifically significant paleontological resources, however, surface disturbing activities and increased human access could produce unexpected discoveries and potential paleontological resource damage. Direct impacts could include damage or destruction during construction, with subsequent loss of information. Indirect impacts would include fossil damage or destruction by erosion due to surface disturbance.

Impacts from the No Action Alternative

Direct and Indirect Impacts

By not approving the project under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impact to paleontological resources in the area.

Cumulative Impacts

While it is likely that there will be no significant cumulative impact from the proposed action, surface-disturbing activities in this area may potentially have negative cumulative impacts on paleontological resources.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

If previously undocumented paleontological sites are encountered during surface disturbing activities, the project proponent will immediately stop all surface disturbing activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. The proponent will then immediately notify the paleontological monitor (if required) or the BLM RFO paleontology resource staff. It is necessary to protect fossil material and their geological context upon discovery during surface disturbing activities. The BLM RFO paleontology resource staff would then evaluate the site. Should the discovery be evaluated as significant, it will be protected in place until mitigation measures can be developed and implemented according to guidelines set by the BLM. Mitigation measures such as data and fossil recovery may be required by the BLM to prevent impacts to newly identified paleontological resources.

4.0 Supporting Information

4.1. List of Preparers

Glen Garnand, Environmental & Planning Coordinator
Harley Davis, Natural Resource Specialist
Al Collar, Geologist
Helen Miller, Rangeland Management Specialist
Russell Fox, Rangeland Management Specialist, Operations
Laura Hronec, Archaeologist
Michael McGee, Hydrologist
Michael Bilbo, Outdoor Recreation Planner & Visual Resource Specialist
Knut Peterson, Outdoor Recreation Planner & Cave Specialist
Randy Howard, Wildlife Biologist
Dan Baggao, Wildlife Biologist
Emily Metcalf, GIS Specialist
Tate Salas, Realty Specialist
Howard Parman, Program Manager, Pecos District

4.2. Literature Cited

- Bureau of Land Management. 1994. Roswell Resource Area Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental impact statement. BLM-NM-PT-94-0009-4410.
- Bureau of Land Management. 1997. Roswell Approved Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision. BLM-NM-PT-98-003-1610. 71 pp.
- Bureau of Land Management. East Roswell Grazing Environmental Impact Statement, Water Table Contour Map of Part of East Chaves County, Geohydrology and Associates 1978. Roswell New Mexico: Bureau of Land Management, Roswell District, 1979.
- Bureau of Land Management and USDA Forest Service. 1994. Rangeland Reform '94, Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
- Climate Change SIR. 2010. Climate Change Supplementary Information Report for Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, Bureau of Land Management. Report on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change for Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Technical report prepared for the Montana/Dakotas Bureau of Land Management by URS Corporation. URS Project 22241790.
- Degenhardt, W. G., C. W. Painter, and A. H. Price. 1996. The amphibians and reptiles of New Mexico. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque. 431 pp.
- Dinerstein, E, D. Olson, J. Atchley, C. Loucks, S. Contreras-Balderas, R. Abell, E. Inigo, E. Enkerlin, C. Williams, and F. Castelleja. 2000. Ecoregion-based conservation in the Chihuahuan Desert: A biological assessment. World Wildlife Fund and others.
- Enquist, Carolyn and Gori, Dave. 2008. Implications of Recent Climate Change on Conservation Priorities in New Mexico. April 2008.
- EPA Inventory of US Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2006. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- EPA, Natural Gas Star Program (2006 data) at: <http://www.epa.gov/gasstar/accomplish.htm>. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. 1983. Flood Insurance Rate Map. Community Panel Nos. 350125 0450B and 0475B.
- Geohydrology Associates, Inc. 1978. Collection of Hydrologic Data, Eastside Roswell Range EIS area, New Mexico. Prepared for BLM under Contract No. YA-512-CT7-217. 97 pp.
- Goddard Institute for Space Studies. 2007. Annual Mean Temperature Change for Three Latitude Bands. Datasets and Images. GISS Surface Temperature Analysis, Analysis Graphs and Plots. New York, New York. (Available on the Internet: <http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/graphs/Fig.B.lrg.gif>.)

- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Basis (Summary for Policymakers). Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, England and New York, New York. (Available on the Internet: <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg1/ar4-wg1-spm.pdf>)
- _____. Climate Change 2007, Synthesis Report. A Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- Knopf, F.L. 1996. Prairie legacies - birds. Pages 135-148 in F. B. Samson and F. L. Knopf, eds. Prairie Conservation: preserving North America's most endangered ecosystem. Island Press, Washington, D. C.
- Knopf, F.L. and F.B. Samson. 1997. Conservation of grassland vertebrates. Ecological Studies 125:273-289.
- Moore, E., E. Janes, F. Kinsinger, K. Pitney, and J. Sainsbury. 1979. Livestock Grazing Management and Water Quality Protection - State of the Art Reference Document. EPA 910/9-79-67. Environmental Protection Agency. Seattle, WA. 147 pp.
- National Academy of Sciences. 2006. Understanding and Responding to Climate Change: Highlights of National Academies Reports. Division on Earth and Life Studies. National Academy of Sciences. Washington, D.C. (Available on the Internet: <http://dels.nas.edu/basc/Climate-HIGH.pdf>.)
- Savory, A. 1988. Holistic Resource Management. Island Press. Washington, D.C.
- Stoddart, L.A., A.D. Smith, and T.W. Box. 1975. Range Management. Third Ed. McGraw-Hill, Inc. New York. 532 pp.
- USDA Soil Conservation Service. 1980. Soil Survey of Chaves County, Southern Part, New Mexico, 145 pp.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2008. Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2006. April 2008. USEPA #430-R-08-005.
- _____. Inventory of US Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2006. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1997. Biological opinion on the Roswell Resource Area Resource Management Plans. Consult. #2-22-96-F-102.
- US Government Accountability Office Report "Climate Change, Agencies Should Develop Guidance for Addressing the Effects on Federal Land and Water Resources" GAO-07-863, August 2007 (1st paragraph, 1st page, GAO Highlights) at: <http://www.gao.gov/news.items/d07863.pdf>.